

Merchant & Gould

An Intellectual Property Law Firm

3200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota
55402-2215 USA
TEL 612.332.5300
FAX 612.332.9081
www.merchant
gould.com

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 11 2006**

A Professional Corporation

Fax Transmission | January 11, 2006

TO: Commissioner for Patents
Attn: Bradley L. Sisson
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FROM: Anne M. Murphy

OUR REF: 7885.56USWO
TELEPHONE: 612.332.5300

PTO FAX NUMBER 1-571-273-8300

Total pages, including cover letter: 12

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 612.371.5267, or fax us at 612.332.9081.

Title of Documents Transmitted:

1. Communication
2. Declaration of Øystein Fodstad
3. Petition Decision dated October 10, 2003
4. Petition for Extension of Time

Applicant: Fodstad et al.
Serial No.: 09/125,953
Filed: December 10, 1998
Group Art Unit: 1634
Our Ref. No.: 07885.0056USWO
Confirmation No. 8358

Please charge \$225.00 to Deposit Account No. 13-2725 for the two-month extension of time for a small entity. Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for a sufficient number of months to enter these papers, if appropriate.

By: Anne M. Murphy
Anne M. Murphy
Reg. No. 54,327

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Patricia L. Larrimore
Signature (Patricia L. Larrimore)

January 11, 2006
Date

GEN033.DOT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 11 2006

S/N 09/125,953

PATENTIN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	FODSTAD et al.	Examiner:	BRADLEY L. SISSON
Serial No.:	09/125,953	Group Art Unit:	1634
Filed:	DECEMBER 10, 1998	Docket No.:	7885.56USWO
Title:	IMMUNO-MAGNETIC CELL SEPARATION USED IN IDENTIFICATION OF GENES ASSOCIATED WITH SITE-PREFERENCED CANCER METASTASIS FORMATION		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.6(d):The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on January 11, 2006.By: Patricia L. Larrimore

Name: Patricia L. Larrimore

COMMUNICATION

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The attached Declaration of Øystein Fodstad is submitted in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed October 26, 2005. The Declaration was previously submitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on August 26, 2002, and receipt of the Declaration by the United States Patent and Trademark Office is confirmed in the attached Petition Decision dated October 10, 2003.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicants' Representative at 612.336.4771.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Dated: January 11, 2006**23552**

PATENT TRADEMARK

Anne M. Murphy
Anne M. Murphy
Reg. No. 54,327
AMM:sll



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1480
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1480
www.uspto.gov

OCT 10 2003

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

In re Application of
Øystein Fodstadl
Serial No.: 09/125,953
Filed: December 10, 1998
Attorney Docket No.: 7885.56US WO

: PETITION DECISION
:
:

This letter is in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.181, filed March 4, 2003, requesting withdrawal of the finality of the last Office action. The delay in acting on this petition is regretted, and has been occasioned by conversion of this application to an Image File Wrapper (IFW) application.

BACKGROUND.

A review of the file history shows that the examiner mailed a first Final Office action to applicants on February 27, 2002, setting a three month shortened statutory period for reply. Claims 2-3, 5-9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as directed to subject matter not described in the specification or as non-enabled.

An amendment after Final rejection was filed on July 26, 2002, including a request and fee for a two month extension of time. The amendment was accompanied by an unsigned affidavit by the inventor under 37 CFR 1.132.

The examiner issued an Advisory Action on August 13, 2002, in which it was indicated in the remarks that the affidavit had not been considered as it was unsigned and was not directed solely to new points of argument or issues raised in the last office action.

On August 26, 2002, applicants filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) with a further extension of time request and fee therefor accompanied by a signed copy of the previously submitted affidavit and requesting that the previous amendment be entered and the finality of the last Office action be withdrawn.

On October 3, 2002, the examiner mailed a new Final Office action to applicants noting the filing of the RCE and repeating the rejections of record. On page 5 of the Office action receipt of the signed copy of the affidavit was acknowledged with the examiner indicating that its submission was untimely. Nevertheless, the affidavit was considered and commented on in the next two paragraphs on page 5, the conclusion being that the affidavit was insufficient to overcome the rejection. In view of the same rejection being made for the same reasons as in the previous Office action the action was made Final.

On March 4, 2003, applicants filed a request for a three month extension of time and requisite fee therefor, an amendment after Final rejection and a petition to withdraw the finality of the last Office action. On April 3, 2003, a second RCE was filed. As noted above, because of the conversion of this application to an IFW application at about the time these papers were filed, the petition inadvertently was not forwarded for consideration until recently.

DISCUSSION

Applicants contend that the last Office action should not have been made Final because the affidavit was timely filed in view of the RCE filing of August 26, 2002, and should have been considered. Applicants have misinterpreted the examiner's comments regarding the affidavit. While the examiner indicated that the affidavit was untimely - i.e., that it could (and perhaps should) have been presented earlier - the examiner did not indicate that the affidavit was not considered. While the unsigned affidavit was specifically not considered in the preceding Advisory Action, the examiner in the Final Office action of October 3, 2002, specifically commented on the affidavit and why it was considered insufficient to overcome the rejection of record. Applicants' argument of non-consideration is thus not found to be supported by the record.

It is also noted that 37 CFR 1.181(b) requires that petitions to the Commissioner regarding any action by an examiner must be filed within two months of the action complained of (some exceptions to this requirement do exist). This petition regarding premature finality of an Office action - an action by the examiner - was not filed until almost six months after the action being complained of and can, therefore, be considered untimely.

DECISION

The petition is **DENIED** for either or both of the reasons set forth above. Finality of the last Office action is deemed to be proper.

The application will be forwarded to the examiner for further consideration of the application in view of the filing of a second RCE.

Should there be any questions with respect to this decision, please contact William R. Dixon, Jr., by mail addressed to: Director, Technology Center 1600, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or by telephone at (703)308-3824 or by facsimile transmission at (703) 305-7230.

John Doll 
Director, Technology Center 1600